The Inverse Scattering Method, Lie–Bäcklund Transformations and Solitons for Low–energy Effective Field Equations of 5D String Theory

Alfredo Herrera–Aguilar

Theoretical Physics Department, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
54006 Thessaloniki, Greece
and Instituto de Física y Matemáticas, UMSNH
Edificio C–3, Ciudad Universitaria, Morelia, Mich. CP 58040 México
e-mail: aherrera@auth.gr

and

Refugio Rigel Mora–Luna

Escuela de Ciencias Físico–Matemáticas, UMSNH
Edificio B, Ciudad Universitaria, Morelia, Mich. CP 58040 México
e-mail: rigel@fismat.umich.mx

Abstract

In the framework of the 5D low–energy effective field theory of the heterotic string with no vector fields excited, we combine two non–linear methods in order to construct a solitonic field configuration. We first apply the inverse scattering method on a trivial vacuum solution and obtain an stationary axisymmetric two–soliton configuration consisting of a massless gravitational field coupled to a non–trivial chargeless dilaton and to an axion field endowed with charge. The implementation of this method was done following a scheme previously proposed by Yurova. We also show that within this scheme, is not possible to get massive gravitational solitons at all. We then apply a non–linear Lie–Bäcklund matrix transformation of Ehlers type on this massless solution and get a massive rotating axisymmetric gravitational soliton coupled to axion and dilaton fields endowed with charges. We study as well some physical properties of the constructed massless and massive solitons and discuss on the effect of the generalized solution generating technique on the seed solution and its further generalizations.

1   Introduction

The aim of this paper is to apply two non–linear methods for constructing solitonic so-
lutions in the framework of the 5D truncation of the low–energy effective field theory of
the heterotic string with no vector fields excited. In a first stage we implement the inverse
scattering method (ISM) on a trivial (flat space–time) seed solution in order to obtain a
solitonic solution. At this step we make use of a chiral $SL(4, \mathbf{R})/SO(4)$ representation of
the stationary axisymmetric theory and construct a rotating massless gravitational soliton
following the scheme proposed by Yurova in [1] for chiral matrices of dimension greater
than two. Afterwards we endow this object with gravitational mass and dilaton charge
by means of a non–linear transformation of Lie–Bäcklund type, the so–called normalized
Ehlers transformation (NET).

In the framework of General Relativity, Belinski and Zakharov [2] demonstrated that
the vacuum stationary axially symmetric gravitational equations written in chiral form may
be integrated with the aid of the ISM. This technique allows one to obtain the N–soliton
configuration starting from flat space–time by making use of a symmetric chiral 2×2–
matrix which must not satisfy any group condition. It was shown, in particular, that the
Kerr–NUT metric can be interpreted as a two–soliton solution of 4D Einstein theory in
the presence of two commuting Killing vectors. As far as we know, the ISM has not been
generalized for gravitational systems involving three space–time variables, i.e. with just
one Killing vector imposed. Thus, in order to apply the ISM to gravitational models and
their extensions we must consider configurations that depend at most on two space–time
coordinates.

In the same way, in the framework of D–dimensional low–energy effective string theories
toroidally reduced down to two space–time dimensions, i.e. in the presence of $D - 2$ Killing
vectors, we hope to obtain black hole (or black brane) solitonic solutions by applying
the ISM. However, in this realm the problem becomes more complicated due to the fact
that, in general, the chiral representations of the reduced low–energy effective field theories
have dimensions greater than two and must satisfy, indeed, non–trivial group conditions.
For instance, the chiral model which describes the low–energy effective field theory of the
heterotic string when reduced to three space–time dimensions possesses the $SO(d + 1, d +
n+1)/[SO(d+1) \times SO(d+n+1)]$ symmetry group [3], where d is the number of compactified
dimensions and n is the number of Abelian vector fields of the theory[1]. Thus, the chiral
representation of this theory involves symmetric matrices of dimension $(2d + n + 2)$ which
must satisfy orthogonal group conditions. As a consequence, the original scheme described
in [2] cannot be applied anymore and must be suitably modified.

In fact, it is not so easy to overcome this difficulty since both, the dimensionality of
the chiral matrices and their group symmetry condition strongly restrict the solitons we
can obtain, leading sometimes to rotating massless gravitational configurations [1] and,
even more, to trivial solutions (see below). For example, in the framework of the scheme

---

[1]In fact, the further reduction of the theory to two space–time dimensions by imposing one more Killing
vector does not increase the dimensionality of the chiral representation.

followed in this paper, this problem reduces to the choice of five relationships between eight constant parameters. However, not every set of such conditions leads to a soliton configuration depending on three parameters. Moreover, among them there are conditions that lead to trivial objects, i.e., to flat space–time solutions. Thus, this work brings some insight into the understanding of obtaining such solitonic objects, always with the hope of clarifying all the conditions under which we can apply the ISM and construct the general N–soliton solution for systems represented by chiral matrices of any dimension greater than two which, indeed, must satisfy non–trivial symmetry group conditions (see the related works [4], where the ISM has been implemented for special systems in the framework of string theory).

Another interesting issue concerns the physical interpretation of the constructed soliton since it describes a massless gravitational object[2] coupled to non–trivial dilaton and Kalb–Ramond fields. However, despite the massless character of the gravitational configuration, it possesses angular momentum, a strange feature that must be clarified. In this context, it is also interesting to see whether or not it is possible to endow our two–solitonic configuration with gravitational mass and dilaton charge since there is no way to get a massive solution when implementing the ISM on a trivial solution within the scheme proposed by Yurova (see Sec. III). In order to achieve this goal we apply a solution generating technique based on the use of a non–linear transformation of Lie–Bäcklund type [5], namely, we perform the NET [6] on our massless two–soliton and get a rotating gravitational configuration with mass term coupled to dilaton and axion fields endowed with their respective charges.

It is with this motivation that we perform the present investigation. The paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II we present the 5D low–energy effective action of the theory under consideration as well as the matrix Ernst potential (MEP) formulation of the reduced down to three dimensions theory. Then we recall the NET of the stationary theory in the language of the MEP and write down an alternative $SL(4, \mathbf{R})/SO(4)$ representation of the stationary theory. In Sec. III we describe the ISM and the modifications that one must perform in order to apply it to our string system. Afterwards we show that, within the scheme proposed by Yurova, one can construct just massless gravitational solitons and present an explicit exact solution. We also analyze some physical properties of this two–soliton object. In Sec. IV we perform a simplified NET on a seed solution which corresponds to the solitonic configuration constructed in Sec. III and get a gravitational soliton endowed with mass term. We study as well some physical properties and limits of the obtained solution. Finally, in Sec. V we summarize our results and discuss on the physical peculiarities of the constructed solutions and also analyze the technical details of the implemented non–linear methods that produce them. Here we give as well some suggestions concerning the further development and generalization of the techniques applied in this work.

---

[2]An object without mass term in the asymptotical expansion of the g_{tt}–component of the metric tensor.

2 Low–energy Effective Action

We shall study the 5D low–energy effective field theory of the heterotic string with no vector fields excited. This theory is described by the following action

$$S^{(5)} = \int d^5x \, |G^{(5)}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \, e^{-\phi^{(5)}} \left(R^{(5)} + \phi^{(5)}_{;M} \, \phi^{(5);M} - \frac{1}{12} H^{(5)}_{MNP} \, H^{(5)MNP} \right), \tag{1}$$

where $H^{(5)}_{MNP} = \partial_M B^{(5)}_{NP} + $ cycl. perms. of M, N, P; $G^{(5)}_{MN}$ is the metric, $B^{(5)}_{MN}$ is the anti–symmetric Kalb–Ramond field, $\phi^{(5)}$ is the dilaton and $M, N, P = 1, 2, ..., 5$. After the Kaluza–Klein compactification of this model on T^2 [3], the resulting stationary theory possesses the $SO(3,3)/[SO(3) \times SO(3)]$ symmetry group and describes the three–dimensional dilaton field ϕ and the scalar 2×2–matrices $G \equiv G_{pq}$ and $B \equiv B_{pq}$

$$\phi = \phi^{(5)} - \frac{1}{2}\ln|\det G|, \qquad G_{pq} = G^{(5)}_{p+3,q+3}, \qquad B_{pq} = B^{(5)}_{p+3,q+3}, \tag{2}$$

where $p, q = 1, 2$ label the time and extra coordinates, respectively; the vector fields represented by the 2×3–matrices $(A_1)^p_\mu$ and $(A_2)^{p+2}_\mu$

$$(A_1)^p_\mu = \frac{1}{2} \left(G^{-1} \right)_{pq} G^{(5)}_{q+3,\mu}, \qquad (A_2)^{p+2}_\mu = \frac{1}{2} B^{(5)}_{p+3,\mu} - B_{pq} A^q_\mu, \tag{3}$$

where $\mu, \nu = 1, 2, 3$ are the dynamical coordinates; and the antisymmetric tensor field $B_{\mu\nu}$ (which we set to zero from now on due to its nondynamical properties in three dimensions)

$$B_{\mu\nu} = B^{(5)}_{\mu\nu} - 4 B_{pq} A^p_\mu A^q_\nu - 2 \left(A^p_\mu A^{p+2}_\nu - A^p_\nu A^{p+2}_\mu \right); \tag{4}$$

all these fields are effectively coupled to three–dimensional gravity which is described by the metric tensor

$$g_{\mu\nu} = e^{-2\phi} \left[G^{(5)}_{\mu,\nu} - G^{(5)}_{p+3,\mu} G^{(5)}_{q+3,\nu} \left(G^{-1} \right)_{pq} \right]. \tag{5}$$

It turns out that for stationary configurations, the vector fields can be dualized on–shell through the pseudoscalar fields u and v as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla \times \overrightarrow{A_1} &= \frac{1}{2} e^{2\phi} G^{-1} \left(\nabla u + B \nabla v \right), \\
\nabla \times \overrightarrow{A_2} &= \frac{1}{2} e^{2\phi} G \nabla v - B \nabla \times \overrightarrow{A_1},
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where all vector and differential operations are performed with respect to the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$.

Thus, the effective stationary theory describes gravity $g_{\mu\nu}$ coupled to the scalars G, B, ϕ and the pseudoscalars u, v.

2.1 Matrix Ernst Potentials

All these matter fields can be arranged in the following matrix

$$\mathcal{X} = \begin{pmatrix} -e^{-2\phi} + v^T X v & v^T X - u^T \\ X v + u & X \end{pmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

where $X = G + B$. This is a 3×3–matrix which was called matrix Ernst potential in [7] because of the close analogy existing between the representation the low–energy effective field theory of the heterotic string and the formulation of the stationary Einstein–Maxwell (EM) theory in terms of the complex Ernst potentials [8]. Its components have the following physical meaning: the relevant information about the gravitational field is contained in the matrix potential X through the matrix G, whereas its rotational character is encoded in the dualized variable u; X also parameterizes the antisymmetric Kalb–Ramond tensor field B, whereas its multidimensional components are dualized through v, finally, the 3D dilaton is ϕ. In terms of the MEP the effective stationary theory adopts the form

$$^3S = \int d^3x \, | \, g \, |^{\frac{1}{2}} \{-R + \text{Tr}[\frac{1}{4} (\nabla \mathcal{X}) \mathcal{G}^{-1} (\nabla \mathcal{X}^T) \mathcal{G}^{-1}]\}, \tag{8}$$

where $\mathcal{G} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}^T)$ is the symmetric part of the matrix potential $\mathcal{X}$, whereas the antisymmetric one reads $\mathcal{B} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{X}^T)$. The MEP $\mathcal{X}$ can be expressed as the sum of its symmetric and antisymmetric parts: $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{G} + \mathcal{B}$ where

$$\mathcal{G} = \begin{pmatrix} -e^{-2\phi} + v^T G v & v^T G \\ G v & G \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v^T B - u^T \\ B v + u & B \end{pmatrix}. \tag{9}$$

2.2 The Normalized Ehlers Transformation

In the language of the MEP the stationary action (8) possesses a set of symmetries which has been classified according to their charging properties in [6]. Among them we find the so–called normalized Ehlers and Harrison transformations, NET and NHT respectively, which act in a non–trivial way on the space–time when applying solution generating techniques. For instance, in the framework of General Relativity, the Ehlers transformation generates the NUT parameter when applied to both Schwarzschild and Kerr solutions, whereas the Harrison transformation endows these metrics with electromagnetic charges. We would like to mention that the NET constitutes a matrix generalization of the charging symmetry of Lie–Bäcklund type introduced by Ehlers in the framework of General Relativity [9].

The matrix NET transformation reads [6]

$$\mathcal{X} \rightarrow (1 + \Sigma\Lambda) (1 + \mathcal{X}_0\Lambda)^{-1} \mathcal{X}_0 (1 - \Lambda\Sigma) + \Sigma\Lambda\Sigma, \tag{10}$$

where $\Sigma = diag(-1, -1; 1)$ and Λ is an arbitrary antisymmetric constant 3×3–matrix parameter $\Lambda = -\Lambda^T$. In the framework of solution generating techniques, by applying

the NET on a stationary seed solution we obtain a new stationary solution endowed with three more parameters introduced through the antisymmetric matrix Λ. We shall apply this technique in Sec. IV on a solitonic seed solution constructed by means of the ISM in order to further analyze the physical effect of the NET and the physical properties of the generated solution.

2.3 $SL(4, \mathbf{R})/SO(4)$ **Chiral Representation of the Model**

In [10] it was pointed out that apart of $SO(3,3)/[SO(3) \times SO(3)]$ symmetry group formulation, the stationary system under consideration allows an alternative $SL(4, \mathbf{R})/SO(4)$ chiral parametrization. The latter formulation is more convenient since it is parameterized by 4×4–matrices instead of 6×6–matrices, and has to satisfy a trivial group condition. Thus, the chiral action reads

$$^3S = \int d^3x \, | \, g \, |^{\frac{1}{2}} [-R + \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} \left(J^{\mathcal{N}} \right)^2], \tag{11}$$

where $J^{\mathcal{N}} = \nabla \mathcal{N} \mathcal{N}^{-1}$, the symmetric matrix $\mathcal{N}$ is

$$\mathcal{N} = (\det \mathcal{G})^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{G} & \mathcal{G}\mathcal{H} \\ \mathcal{H}^T\mathcal{G} & \det\mathcal{G} + \mathcal{H}^T\mathcal{G}\mathcal{H} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{12}$$

the 3×1–column $\mathcal{H}$ is determined by the relation $\mathcal{H}_k \epsilon_{mnk} = \mathcal{B}_{mn} \equiv \mathcal{B}$, the matrix potentials $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are defined in (9), ϵ_{mnk} is the antisymmetric tensor with $\epsilon_{123} = 1$ and $m, n, k = 1, 2, 3$. The matrix $\mathcal{N}$ is indeed unimodular and belongs to the $SL(4, \mathbf{R})/SO(4)$ group.

Let us consider an axially symmetric field configuration. In this case the spatial metric can be written in the Lewis–Papapetrou form

$$ds_3^2 = g_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu = e^{2\gamma}(d\rho^2 + dz^2) + \rho^2 d\varphi^2, \tag{13}$$

the effective action of the system can be expressed as follows

$$^2S = \frac{1}{4} \int d\rho dz \rho \text{Tr} \left(J^{\mathcal{N}} \right)^2, \tag{14}$$

and the matrix field equation reads

$$\nabla \left(\rho J^{\mathcal{N}} \right) = 0. \tag{15}$$

The corresponding Einstein equations determine the function γ through the relations

$$\gamma_{,z} = \frac{\rho}{4} \text{Tr} \left(J_\rho^{\mathcal{N}} J_z^{\mathcal{N}} \right), \qquad \gamma_{,\rho} = \frac{\rho}{8} \text{Tr} \left[\left(J_\rho^{\mathcal{N}} \right)^2 - \left(J_z^{\mathcal{N}} \right)^2 \right], \tag{16}$$

where the operator ∇ is related to the flat two–metric δ_{ab} and all dynamical variables depend on ρ and z only. These equations are automatically satisfied once a solution for (12), or equivalently (9), is found. In the next Sec. we shall construct a solitonic solution to this matrix equation by means of the ISM.

6

3 Solitons Via ISM

In this Sec. we shall continue to apply the inverse scattering technique in order to construct soliton solutions for the 5D low–energy effective field theory under consideration. However, because of the symmetry condition that the real chiral matrix $\mathcal{N}$ must satisfy, the original scheme of Belinski and Zakharov is not applicable anymore and the implementation of such a powerful method turns out to be not so simple. Another problem is related to the dimension of the chiral matrix for which solitons are constructed. The point here is that the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ must possess certain asymptotic properties which correspond to concrete physical values that the fields must adopt at spatial infinity. Thus, the bigger the dimension of the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ is, the more boundary conditions we must impose on it. In this context we shall avoid these difficulties following the modification of the ISM proposed by Yurova. Thus, the integration of the field equations (15) is associated with the L–A pair

$$D_1\psi = \frac{\rho J_z^N - \lambda J_\rho^N}{\lambda^2 + \rho^2}\psi, \qquad D_2\psi = \frac{\rho J_\rho^N + \lambda J_z^N}{\lambda^2 + \rho^2}\psi, \tag{17}$$

where $J^N = \rho J^{\mathcal{N}}$ and the differential operators are

$$D_1 = \partial_z - \frac{2\lambda^2}{\lambda^2 + \rho^2}\partial_\lambda, \qquad D_2 = \partial_\rho + \frac{2\lambda\rho}{\lambda^2 + \rho^2}\partial_\lambda, \tag{18}$$

λ is a spectral complex parameter and $\psi = \psi(\lambda, \rho, z)$. The solution of (15) for the symmetric matrix $\mathcal{N}$ constitutes the function ψ with vanishing value of the spectral parameter, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N}(\rho, z) = \psi(0, \rho, z). \tag{19}$$

Thus, for any known solution ψ_0 of the system (17)–(18), the function ψ can be obtained in the form

$$\psi = \chi\psi_0, \tag{20}$$

where the equations for χ are

$$D_1\chi = \frac{\rho J_z^N - \lambda J_\rho^N}{\lambda^2 + \rho^2}\chi - \chi\frac{\rho(J_z^N)_0 - \lambda(J_\rho^N)_0}{\lambda^2 + \rho^2}, \qquad D_2\chi = \frac{\rho J_\rho^N + \lambda J_z^N}{\lambda^2 + \rho^2}\chi - \chi\frac{\rho(J_\rho^N)_0 + \lambda(J_z^N)_0}{\lambda^2 + \rho^2}.$$

The matrix $\mathcal{N}$ must be real and symmetric; in order to ensure its real character, we shall impose the condition

$$\chi(\lambda) = \bar{\chi}(\bar{\lambda}) \tag{21}$$

(see [2] for details). However, in order to apply the ISM to chiral matrices with dimension greater than two, the symmetry requirement must be imposed after the construction of the solitonic solution. Thus, after the implementation of ISM, the constructed matrix $\mathcal{N}$ will not be symmetric and we must impose this condition afterwards.

The soliton solutions for the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ correspond to the pole divergences in the spectral parameter complex plane for the matrices χ and χ^{-1}. When the poles are simple, these matrices can be represented as follows:

$$\chi = I + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{R_k}{\lambda - \mu_k}, \qquad \chi^{-1} = I + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{S_k}{\lambda - \nu_k}, \tag{22}$$

where the pole trajectories for each pole k are determined by

$$\mu_k(\rho, z) = w_{(\mu)} - z \pm [(w_{(\mu)} - z)^2 + \rho^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad w_{(\mu)} = \text{const.} \tag{23}$$

for $\mu_k(\rho, z)$ and the same equation for $\nu_k(\rho, z)$ with constants $w_{(\nu)}$. From $\chi\chi^{-1} = I$ in the poles μ_k and ν_k it follows that

$$R_k \chi^{-1}(\mu_k) = S_k \chi(\nu_k) = 0. \tag{24}$$

Hence the matrices R_k and S_k are degenerate and can be represented as follows

$$(R_k)_{ab} = n_a^k m_b^k, \qquad (S_k)_{ab} = p_a^k q_b^k. \tag{25}$$

By substituting Eqs. (22) and (25) into Eq. (24) we obtain

$$n_a^k = \sum_{l=1}^{N} p_a^l \Gamma_{kl}^{-1}, \qquad q_a^k = -\sum_{l=1}^{N} m_a^l \Gamma_{kl}^{-1}, \quad \text{where} \quad \Gamma_{kl} = \frac{\sum_c p_c^k m_c^l}{\mu_l - \nu_k}, \tag{26}$$

$$m_a^k = [\psi_0^{-1}(\mu_k, \rho, z)]_{ca} m_{c0}^k, \qquad \text{and} \qquad p_a^k = [\psi_0(\nu_k, \rho, z)]_{ac} p_{c0}^k, \tag{27}$$

where m_{c0}^k and p_{c0}^k are arbitrary constants and $a, b, c = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

When considering the two–soliton case, in [1] it was shown that in order to have a unimodular matrix $\mathcal{N}$, the relation

$$\mu_1 \mu_2 = \nu_1 \nu_2 \tag{28}$$

is really important and it constitutes the main difference with respect to the scheme proposed by Belinski and Zakharov since it is not compatible with the symmetry requirement $\mathcal{N} = \chi(-\rho^2/\lambda)\mathcal{N}_0 \chi^T(\lambda)$ of [2]. As a consequence, the resulting unimodular matrix $\mathcal{N}$ will be non–symmetric. However, the symmetry conditions may be attained by a suitable choice of the arbitrary parameters of (27).

Let us apply the modified ISM in order to construct a stationary axially symmetric two–soliton solution for the 5D string model which is described by the effective action (14) when reduced to two dimensions.

In the simplest case, the initial values of the metric and field variables correspond to flat space–time. Thus, the seed chiral matrix adopts the form

$$\mathcal{N}_0 = \text{diag}(-1, -1; 1, 1). \tag{29}$$

8

We shall construct the solitonic solution using the set of coordinates of Boyer and Lindquist without mass. This is due to the fact that the resulting two–soliton gravitational solution corresponds to a massless source (see bellow for details). Thus, we have

$$\rho = \left(r^2 - \sigma^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sin\theta, \qquad z - z_1 = r\cos\theta, \tag{30}$$

where the new constants $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}(w_{(\mu)} - w_{(\nu)})$ and $z_1 = \frac{1}{2}(w_{(\mu)} + w_{(\nu)})$. Consequently, the pole trajectories read

$$\mu_1 = 2\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}(r+\sigma), \qquad \mu_2 = -2\cos^2\frac{\theta}{2}(r-\sigma),$$

$$\nu_1 = -2\cos^2\frac{\theta}{2}(r+\sigma), \qquad \nu_2 = 2\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}(r-\sigma), \tag{31}$$

and obviously satisfy the condition (28). Since $\mathcal{N}_0 = \psi_0^{-1}(\mu_k, \rho, z) = \psi_0(\nu_k, \rho, z)$, then the vectors p_a^k and m_a^k constitute arbitrary constants (see Eq. (27)). Thus, by applying the scheme described above, one can construct the matrix two–soliton solution $\mathcal{N}$ for Eq. (15) depending on these vectors. Such a matrix will be unimodular, but not symmetric. The following conditions provide the symmetric character of the matrix $\mathcal{N}$:

$$m_a^k = p_a^k, \tag{32}$$

for all a, k; and

$$p_3^2 = p_3^1, \qquad p_2^2 = \left(p_3^1\right)^2 / p_2^1, \qquad p_4^2 = p_4^1 = -p_1^1 p_3^1 / p_2^1, \qquad p_1^2 = \left(p_3^1/p_2^1\right)^2 p_1^1. \tag{33}$$

Thus, only three constants survive the symmetrization of the matrix $\mathcal{N}$. However, we would like to point out that just the condition (32) is not enough to ensure the symmetry character of $\mathcal{N}$, it leaves eight arbitrary constants, but it does not lead to a symmetric matrix $\mathcal{N}$. Moreover, we must impose five more restrictions on these eight constants in order to obtain the desired symmetric matrix $\mathcal{N}$. The choice of these restrictions is not unique and the constants are not independent each other. Moreover, some choices lead to a trivial soliton solution or to a solution that depends on just two arbitrary constants instead of three. In this respect, we observe some differences between our choice of constants and the one performed by Yurova. For example, by setting our p_1^1 to zero we just set to zero one parameter of the solution, whereas within the choice made in [1], the author claims that if any of the constants p_a^k is set to zero, all other constants vanish as well and the constructed solution turns out to be a trivial one. This fact, in turn, leads to slightly different solitonic solutions from the physical point of view (see below).

3.1 Massless Character of the Gravitational Soliton

Now we shall show that when constructing the two–soliton solution and imposing the condition (32) towards the symmetrization of the matrix $\mathcal{N}$, we necessarily obtain a massless gravitational field configuration. Thus, after taking into account the restrictions (32), we obtain a chiral matrix $\mathcal{N}$ which has the following block structure and asymptotic behaviour

$$
\mathcal{N}_{as} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} N_1 & N_2 \\ N_3 & N_4 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & n_{12}/r & n_{13}/r & n_{14}/r \\ n_{21}/r & -1 & n_{23}/r & n_{24}/r \\ n_{31}/r & n_{32}/r & 1 & n_{34}/r \\ n_{41}/r & n_{42}/r & n_{43}/r & 1 \end{pmatrix},
\tag{34}
$$

where N_1 is a 3×3–matrix, N_2 is a 3×1–column, N_3 is a 1×3–row and $N_4 = 1$,

$$
n_{ac} = 2\kappa\sigma\frac{p_a^1 p_c^2 - p_c^1 p_a^2}{p_b^1 p_b^2 r}, \quad a \neq c, \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa = \begin{cases} -1, & a = 1, 2. \\ 1, & a = 3, 4. \end{cases}
\tag{35}
$$

On the other side, the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ is defined through $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ through the relation (12). By equating both representations we can, in principle, compute the *non–symmetric* matrix $\mathcal{G}_{as} = \left(N_4 - N_3 N_1^{-1} N_2\right) N_1$ which asymptotically behaves as follows

$$
\mathcal{G}_{as} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & n_{12}/r & n_{13}/r \\ n_{21}/r & -1 & n_{23}/r \\ n_{31}/r & n_{32}/r & 1 \end{pmatrix}
\tag{36}
$$

and obviously does not possess Coulomb terms in the diagonal components. Thus, when looking for constructing a massive gravitational solitonic configuration within this concrete modified version of the ISM, it does not matter what kind of relationships we choose between the remaining eight constants p_a^k, since the conditions (32) are sufficient to restrict us to obtain massless solitons.

Thus, by imposing the conditions (32), it is not possible at all to obtain a massive gravitational two–soliton solution. This fact also shows how strong, from the physical point of view, are the restrictions we must impose on our matrix $\mathcal{N}$ in order to make possible the application of the ISM to chiral matrices of dimension greater than two. It remains an open question whether a different scheme of symmetrization of the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ can lead to massive gravitational solitons in the framework of the considered model. A current research in this direction is being performed by the authors.

3.2 Explicit Two–soliton Solution

Once the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ is constructed taking into account the conditions (32) and (33), we can come back to the original variables of the theory with the aid of (12), (9) and (2)–(6). At this stage it is convenient to introduce the following notations

$$
a = \frac{\sigma\left[(p_3^1)^2 + (p_2^1)^2\right]}{2p_2^1 p_3^1}, \qquad b = \frac{\sigma(p_1^1)^2\left[(p_3^1)^2 - (p_2^1)^2\right]}{2p_2^1 p_3^1\left[(p_1^1)^2 + (p_2^1)^2\right]}, \qquad c = \frac{\sigma p_2^1\left[(p_3^1)^2 - (p_2^1)^2\right]}{2p_3^1\left[(p_1^1)^2 + (p_2^1)^2\right]}, \quad (37)
$$

which establishes the following relation $\sigma^2 = a^2 - (b + c)^2$; let us define as well

$$\Delta = r^2 - \sigma^2, \qquad \delta^2 = r^2 + c^2 - (b - a\cos\theta)^2. \tag{38}$$

Now we shall write down the final expression of the constructed two–soliton by implementation of the ISM. The 5D line element reads

$$ds_5^2 = G_{pq}(dx^p - \omega_\varphi^p d\varphi)(dx^q - \omega_\varphi^q d\varphi) + e^{2\phi}ds_3^2, \tag{39}$$

where the components of the matrix G_{pq} have the form

$$G_{11} = -\frac{r^2 + b^2 - (c - a\cos\theta)^2}{\delta^2}, \qquad G_{12} = \frac{2cr}{\delta^2}, \qquad G_{22} = \frac{r^2 + b^2 - (c + a\cos\theta)^2}{\delta^2}, \tag{40}$$

the metric functions ω_φ^q are

$$\omega_\varphi^1 = \frac{-2a\sqrt{bc}\, r\sin^2\theta}{\Delta + a^2\sin^2\theta}, \qquad \omega_\varphi^2 = 2\sqrt{bc}\left[\cos\theta + \frac{a\,(b + c - a\cos\theta)\sin^2\theta}{\Delta + a^2\sin^2\theta}\right], \tag{41}$$

the three–dimensional dilaton field is

$$e^{2\phi} = 1 - \frac{4bc}{\Delta + a^2\sin^2\theta}, \tag{42}$$

and the expression for the spatial line element is the following

$$ds_3^2 = \left(\Delta + a^2\sin^2\theta\right)\left[\frac{dr^2}{\Delta} + d\theta^2\right] + \Delta\sin^2\theta d\varphi^2. \tag{43}$$

The components of the antisymmetric Kalb–Ramond tensor field are defined by the relations

$$B_{12} = \frac{2br}{\delta^2}, \qquad B_{4,\varphi}^{(5)} = \frac{2\sqrt{bc}\, r(2b\cos\theta + a\sin^2\theta)}{\delta^2}, \qquad B_{5,\varphi}^{(5)} = 2\sqrt{bc}\left[\cos\theta - \frac{a(c - b + a\cos\theta)\sin^2\theta}{\delta^2}\right]. \tag{44}$$

Finally, the 5D dilaton field reads

$$e^{\phi^{(5)}} = \frac{r^2 + (b - c)^2 - a^2\cos^2\theta}{\delta^2}. \tag{45}$$

These expressions describe an stationary axially symmetric massless gravitational field configuration coupled to a non–trivial dilaton field without charge and to an axion field endowed with charge. A novel feature of this configuration is that it possesses angular momentum. By analyzing the asymptotical behaviour of the functions ω_φ^q we observe that ω_φ^1 defines the angular momentum according to the following relation

$$\omega_\varphi^1 \mid_{r\to\infty} \sim \frac{-2a\sqrt{bc}\sin^2\theta}{r}, \tag{46}$$

11

whereas ω_φ^2 is not an asymptotically flat quantity since at spatial infinity it behaves as

$$\omega_\varphi^2 \mid_{r\to\infty} \sim 2\sqrt{bc}\cos\theta \tag{47}$$

and defines a NUT–like parameter. However, it is worth noticing that in order to obtain an asymptotically flat field configuration we can set to zero either the parameter b or c. In the first case the remaining configuration constitutes a massless static inhomogeneous gravitational field with non–trivial components of the matrix G_{pq} with no dilaton and Kalb–Ramond fields excited. In the second case the truncated configuration is different, it represents a massless static inhomogeneous gravitational field with non–zero components G_{11} and G_{22} coupled to a non–trivial massless 5D dilaton field and endowed with an axion field which possesses a charge term. One can notice another quite strange property of our soliton: as soon as we require asymptotic flatness, the solution becomes static (see Eqs. (46) and (47)). In this respect, the soliton constructed in [1] has quite different properties since in order to get an asymptotically flat field configuration we must set to zero both parameters b and c, obtaining a trivial solution in this way. Thus, that solitonic solution does not contain asymptotically flat field configurations.

In both of the considered limits ($b = 0$ and $c = 0$) we obtained static inhomogeneous field configurations even when the parameter a, which usually is the responsible for the rotation of the gravitational field, is not vanishing. Thus, our solitonic configuration does not contain a spherically symmetric subclass of solutions (in accordance with the soliton constructed in [1]). Comparison to other results in the literature shows [11] that this solutions are not obtained by setting to zero the mass or other parameters. Of course, it is interesting to study other physical properties of these massless solitonic configurations. At first glance it seems that these solutions correspond to both rotating or static inhomogeneous black strings since we have the presence of horizons, however, this topic deserves further investigation.

4   Massive Gravitational Solitons Via NET

Since the implemented version of the ISM cannot provide gravitational solitons with mass term, it is an open question whether non–linear methods can provide such objects in 5D low–energy effective string theories. In this Section we shall focus on this issue. One way to approach this topic is to look for the way of endowing the gravitational and dilaton fields with mass and charge terms, respectively, and then, to see, for instance, if the obtained solution corresponds to a known class. In this way it is also possible to get new massive solutions. In order to introduce more parameters in the constructed solitonic configuration one can make use of a solution generating technique. Thus, we will apply the Lie–Bäcklund transformation NET (10) on a seed solution which corresponds to the massless gravitational soliton constructed in the previous Section.

The corresponding seed MEP $\mathcal{X}_0 = \mathcal{G}_0 + \mathcal{B}_0$ reads

$$\mathcal{X}_0 = \delta^{-2} \begin{pmatrix} -\delta^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 4\sqrt{bc}(b + c - a\cos\theta) & -[r^2 + b^2 - (c - a\cos\theta)^2] & 2(b+c)r \\ 4\sqrt{bc}\,r & 2(c-b)r & r^2 + b^2 - (c + a\cos\theta)^2 \end{pmatrix}, (48)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_0$ and $\mathcal{B}_0$ are the matrix potentials (9) that parameterize the constructed solitonic chiral matrix (12). Here we shall use a quite simple antisymmetric matrix Λ, namely, a matrix with just one non–trivial constant parameter

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M \\ 0 & -M & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{49}$$

Thus, after performing the non–linear transformation (10) on $\mathcal{X}_0$ we obtain a new solution of the theory under consideration. We shall present the complete solution omitting all lengthy intermediate calculations. Thus, the components of the transformed matrix G_{pq} are

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{11} &= -\frac{(M^2 - 1)\left[r^2 + b^2 - (c - a\cos\theta)^2\right] - 4cM(r + Ma\cos\theta)}{(M^2 - 1)\delta^2 + 4bM(r - Ma\cos\theta)}, \\
G_{12} &= \frac{2c\left[(M^2 + 1)r + 2Ma\cos\theta\right]}{(M^2 - 1)\delta^2 + 4bM(r - Ma\cos\theta)}, \\
G_{22} &= \frac{(M^2 - 1)\left[r^2 + b^2 - (c + a\cos\theta)^2\right] + 4cM(r + Ma\cos\theta)}{(M^2 - 1)\delta^2 + 4bM(r - Ma\cos\theta)},
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

the transformed metric functions ω_φ^q are

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_\varphi^1 &= \frac{-2a\sqrt{bc}\left[(M^2 - 1)r + 2M(b + c)\right]\sin^2\theta}{(M^2 - 1)\left(\Delta + a^2\sin^2\theta\right)}, \\
\omega_\varphi^2 &= 2\sqrt{bc}\left[\cos\theta - \frac{a\left[(M^2 + 1)(b + c) + (M^2 - 1)a\cos\theta\right]\sin^2\theta}{(M^2 - 1)\left(\Delta + a^2\sin^2\theta\right)}\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

the three–dimensional dilaton field remains the same under the NET, thus

$$e^{2\phi} = 1 - \frac{4bc}{\Delta + a^2\sin^2\theta}. \tag{52}$$

The transformed components of the antisymmetric Kalb–Ramond field are the following

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{12} &= \frac{-2b\left[(M^2 + 1)r - 2Ma\cos\theta\right]}{(M^2 - 1)\delta^2 + 4bM(r - Ma\cos\theta)}, \\
B_{4,\varphi}^{(5)} &= -2\sqrt{bc}\left\{\frac{\left[2(b + c)M - (M^2 - 1)r\right]a\sin^2\theta}{(M^2 - 1)\left(\Delta^2 + a^2\sin^2\theta\right)}\right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{2b\left[(M^2+1)\,r - 2Ma\cos\theta\right]\left[(M^2-1)\,\Delta - (M^2+1)\,(b+c)a\sin^2\theta\right]}{(M^2-1)\left(\Delta^2 + a^2\sin^2\theta\right)\left[(M^2-1)\,\delta^2 + 4bM\,(r - Ma\cos\theta)\right]}\Bigg\}, \quad (53)$$

$$B_{5,\varphi}^{(5)} = 2\sqrt{bc}\left\{\frac{\left[(M^2-1)\,\Delta\cos\theta + (M^2+1)\,(b+c)a\sin^2\theta\right]}{(M^2-1)\left(\Delta^2 + a^2\sin^2\theta\right)}\right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{2ab\left[(M^2+1)\,r - 2Ma\cos\theta\right]\left[2(b+c)M + (M^2-1)\,r\right]\sin^2\theta}{(M^2-1)\left(\Delta^2 + a^2\sin^2\theta\right)\left[(M^2-1)\,\delta^2 + 4bM\,(r - Ma\cos\theta)\right]}\right\}$$

and the 5D dilaton field reads

$$e^{\phi^{(5)}} = \frac{(M^2-1)\left[r^2 + (b-c)^2 - a^2\cos^2\theta\right]}{(M^2-1)\,\delta^2 + 4bM\,(r - Ma\cos\theta)}. \quad (54)$$

It is a straightforward exercise to check that when M vanishes, we recover the seed solitonic solution. By studying the asymptotic behaviour of the field configuration we can obtain information about the existence of its masses and charges. Thus, for the components G_{pq} we observe that there exist mass terms

$$G_{11}\mid_{r\to\infty}\sim -1 + \frac{2m_{11}}{r}, \qquad G_{12}\mid_{r\to\infty}\sim -\frac{m_{12}}{r}, \qquad G_{22}\mid_{r\to\infty}\sim 1 - \frac{2m_{22}}{r}, \quad (55)$$

where the masses m_{pq} are defined as follows

$$m_{11} = \frac{2(b+c)M}{(M^2-1)}, \qquad m_{12} = \frac{2c\,(M^2+1)}{(M^2-1)}, \qquad m_{22} = \frac{2(b-c)M}{(M^2-1)}. \quad (56)$$

Analogously, we see that the transformed rotation functions ω_φ^q and the three–dimensional dilaton maintain the same asymptotic behaviour, i.e., they do not change their behaviour at spatial infinity under the NET. The transformed component B_{12} of the antisymmetric tensor field as well as the 5D dilaton possess Coulomb terms

$$B_{12}\mid_{r\to\infty}\sim \frac{b_{12}}{r}, \qquad e^{\phi^{(5)}}\mid_{r\to\infty}\sim 1 + \frac{D}{r}, \quad (57)$$

where the new charges have been introduced

$$b_{12} = \frac{2b\,(M^2+1)}{(1-M^2)}, \qquad D = \frac{4bM}{(1-M^2)}. \quad (58)$$

Finally, the asymptotic behaviour of the $B_{p+3,\varphi}^{(5)}$ components of the Kalb–Ramond field reads

$$B_{4,\varphi}^{(5)}\mid_{r\to\infty}\sim \frac{2\sqrt{bc}\left[-2b\,(M^2+1)\cos\theta + a\,(M^2-1)\right]\sin^2\theta}{(M^2-1)\,r}, \qquad B_{5,\varphi}^{(5)}\mid_{r\to\infty}\sim 2\sqrt{bc}\cos\theta. \quad (59)$$

Thus, we have obtained a stationary axially symmetric massive gravitational field config- uration coupled to non–trivial dilaton and axion fields endowed with their corresponding

charges. Again, in order to obtain an asymptotically flat field configuration we can set to zero either b or c. If c vanishes we get a static inhomogeneous gravitational field with massive components G_{11} and G_{22} coupled to non–trivial Kalb–Ramond and dilaton fields endowed with their corresponding charges. In the case when b is set to zero, we recover a static inhomogeneous gravitational field with massive components G_{pq} and vanishing dilaton and antisymmetric fields.

Once again we observe that when we impose the asymptotically flatness condition, we automatically get a static field configuration since by setting to zero the NUT–like parameter implies the vanishing of the whole metric functions (51). Thus, if our soliton represents a rotating field configuration, it necessarily possesses the NUT–like parameter and if we search for an asymptotically flat solution, it necessarily becomes static. This feature is not shared by rotating configurations in General Relativity where, for instance, one obtains the Kerr metric from the Kerr–NUT one when the NUT charge vanishes. This fact is a consequence of the relationships that take place between the constants a, b and c, which are arbitrary, but not independent each other (for instance, from (37) it can be seen that $b \sim c$). It seems that this is, in turn, a consequence of the restrictions (32) and (33) which we imposed on the constants p_a^k in order to get a symmetric chiral matrix $\mathcal{N}$. It is interesting to propose another scheme for symmetrizing the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ which would avoid this strange physical behaviour of the constructed solitonic solutions and could, in principle, provide the presence of mass and charge terms for the fields of our configuration.

5   Conclusions and Discussion

In this paper we have combined two non–linear methods in order to construct a solitonic gravitational field configuration to the 5D low–energy bosonic sector of string theory. By following the modified version of the ISM proposed by Yurova we clarified the unavoidable massless character of the obtained gravitational solitonic solutions. Therefore, by imposing suitable conditions on the constants that parameterize the chiral matrix $\mathcal{N}$, we construct a soliton consisting of a rotating massless gravitational field configuration coupled to a chargeless dilaton and to an axion field endowed with charge. This solution has similar but different physical properties and limits when compared to the solution constructed in [1]. Afterwards, we provide this field configuration with mass and charge terms by performing a simplified non–linear NET on it. Here we would like to point out that the non–trivial physical effect of the NET is quite different in General Relativity and string theory. It is well known that in the framework of General Relativity, the Ehlers transformation provides the presence of the NUT–like charge when applied on vacuum seed solutions [9]. However, within the framework of string theory we observe that a simplified version (with just one parameter) of this transformation provides the mass and dilaton charge when applied on a massless seed gravitational solution and does not affect the NUT parameter at all.

Let us say few words about the physical properties of our massless and massive gravitational field configurations. As it was mentioned above, when looking towards a rotating

black string interpretation of them, we impose the asymptotic flatness condition and set to zero the NUT parameter. However, when we drop the NUT–like charge, the remaining configuration becomes static. Thus, from one side, if our solitons are restricted to be rotating, they necessarily possess a NUT parameter, and, from the other side, if they are conditioned to be asymptotically flat, they are necessarily static. This fact is due to the overall constant factor $\sqrt{bc}$ of the functions ω_φ^p for both massless and massive solutions. Such functions define both the angular momentum of the configurations and their NUT–like charges. It seems that this is, in turn, a consequence of the conditions (32) and (33) we have imposed towards the symmetrization of the matrix $\mathcal{N}$. It is of interest to propose another scheme for symmetrizing the matrix $\mathcal{N}$ which would avoid this strange physical behaviour of the constructed solitonic solutions. This peculiar physical property of our solutions is quite strange, but on the other side, it is quite interesting and deserves more investigation. The computation of the scalar curvature and other invariants will help in clarifying this point. A current investigation in this direction is also in progress.

Within the framework of the solution generating technique using non–linear transformations of Lie–Bäcklund type, it is interesting to see whether the use of a full parameterized constant matrix Λ will affect the asymptotic behaviour of the transformed solution and provide more independent charges. In this way we could obtain a massive rotating solitonic object endowed with NUT–like charge that remains spinning after the vanishing of the NUT parameter. However, such transformation involves really lengthy algebraic calculations which we hope to perform in the near future. Another way of generalizing the present results is by applying this kind of non–linear Lie–Bäcklund transformations to string systems that include vector fields. In this context it is the NHT which must be performed on our massless seed solution. Thus, within the low–energy string theory realm, this methods could, in principle, lead to the construction of new charged black hole (black brane) solutions in $D > 4$ dimensions, where it is known that such objects do exist [11]. Moreover, it is interesting to apply the ISM for the whole spectrum of the reduced to two dimensions low–energy effective field theory of the heterotic string (taking into account the Abelian vector fields). This could be possible because of the mentioned above relationship between this theory and the EM theory. For a review of the ISM applied to the stationary axisymmetric EM system see [12].

Acknowledgments

References

[1] M.V. Yurova, Phys. Rev. D **64** 024022 (2001).

[2] V.A. Belinski and V.E. Zakharov, Sov. Phys. JETP **48** 985 (1978); **50** 1 (1979).

[3] N. Marcus and J.H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B228** 145 (1983); J. Maharana and J.H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B390** 3 (1993); A. Sen, Nucl. Phys. **B434** 179 (1995).

[4] I. Bakas, Nucl. Phys. **B428** 374 (1994); Phys. Rev. D **54** 6424 (1996); H.J. de Vega and N. Sánchez, Phys. Rev. **D47** 3394 (1993); F. Combes, H.J. de Vega, A.V. Mikhailov and N. Sánchez, Phys. Rev. **D50** 2754 (1994); A. Eris, A. Karasu and M. Gurses, J. Math. Phys. **25** 1489 (1984); M.V. Yurova, Gen. Rel. Grav. **32** 2219 (2000); Phys. Rev. **D65** 024024 (2002); O.V. Kechkin, Class. Quantum Grav. **20** 2157 (2003); **20** L225 (2003).

[5] H. Stephani, *Differential Equations and their Solutions Using Symmetries*, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, 1987).

[6] A. Herrera–Aguilar and O. Kechkin, Phys. Rev. **D59** 124006 (1999).

[7] A. Herrera–Aguilar and O. Kechkin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A13** 393 (1998); **A14** 1345 (1999).

[8] F.J. Ernst, Phys. Rev. **168** 1415 (1968); **167** 1175 (1968); J. Math. Phys. **12** 2395 (1971); Z. Perjés, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27** 1668 (1971); W. Israel and G.A. Wilson, J. Math. Phys. **13** 865 (1972).

[9] D. Kramer, H. Stephani, M. McCallum and E. Herlt, *Exact Solutions of the Einstein's Field Equations*, Deutcher Verlag der Wissenschaften (Berlin, 1980).

[10] O. Kechkin and M. Yurova, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **13** 219 (1998).

[11] G.T. Horowitz and A. Sen, Phys. Rev. **D54** 808 (1996); M. Cvetic and D. Youm, Nucl. Phys. **B476** 118 (1996); A.A. Tseytlin, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **11** 689 (1996); R. Kallosh, A. Rajaraman and W.K. Wong, Phys. Rev. **D55** 3246 (1997); J.C. Breckenridge, R.C. Myers, A.W. Peet and C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. **B391** 93 (1997); J.C. Breckenridge, D.A. Lowe, R.C. Myers, A.W. Peet, A. Strominger and C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. **B381** 423 (1996); A. Herrera–Aguilar and O. Kechkin, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A13** 1629 (1998); C.A.R. Herdeiro, Nucl. Phys. **B582** 363 (2000); T. Matos, D. Núñez, G. Estévez and M. Ríos, Gen. Rel. Grav. **32** 1499 (2000); R. Emparan and H.S. Reall, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** 4877 (2002); H. Elvang, Phys. Rev. **D68** 124016 (2003).

[12] V. Belinski and E. Verdaguer, *Gravitational Solitons*, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, 2001).